

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00122 231758Z

43

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 078304

P 231717Z APR 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3042

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0122

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-PLenary DISCUSSIONS, APRIL 22, 1976
(SALT TWO - 988)

1. ROWNY/SCHUKIN, A-1279)

A. ICBM LAUNCHER DEFINITION

SHCHUKIN ASKED IF ROWNY FOUND HELPFUL THAT PART OF THEIR STATEMENT TODAY WHICH SAID THAT NOT ALL ICBM LAUNCHERS NEEDED TO HAVE FIRED AN ICBM IN ORDER TO COUNT. ROWNY REPLIED THAT IT WAS HELPFUL, BUT THAT HE HAD NOT DETECTED ANY FURTHER EXPLANATION OF THEIR TERMS "SPECIALLY DEVELOPED OR DEPLOYED". SCHUKIN SAID THAT EVERY ICBM LAUNCHER "SYSTEM" IS "UNIQUE"; THAT IS, SPECIALLY DEVELOPED TO LAUNCH THAT MISSILE. HE FELT THAT NO PROBLEM EXISTS SINCE UNDER THEIR PROPOSAL IT WOULD BE A VIOLATION OF THE AGREEMENT TO CONVERT A NON-ICBM LAUNCHER TO AN ICBM LAUNCHER. ROWNY ASKED IF THEIR CONCEPT ENVISAGED THE THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY OF A DUAL-CAPABLE LAUNCHER. SCHUKIN ANSWERED IT DID NOT SINCE EACH LAUNCHER WAS "UNIQUE". HE ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT IF A NON-ICBM LAUNCHER FIRED OR HAD CONTAINED AN ICBM, THEN ALL SIMILAR LAUNCHERS WOULD COUNT. HE SAID THAT THIS WAS SIMILAR TO THE MINUTEMAN SITUATION; THAT IS, IF WE DEPLOYED A MMIII MISSILE IN A MMII LAUNCHER, ALL

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00122 231758Z

MMII LAUNCHERS WOULD THEREAFTER COUNT UNDER THE 1320 CEILING.

ROWNY ASKED IF SCHUKIN WAS NOT IN FACT AGREEING WITH OUR CONCEPT EXPRESSED BY THE USE OF THE WORD "TYPE". SCHUKIN SAID THAT THE SIDES WERE VERY CLOSE TOGETHER INSOFAR AS ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS WERE CONCERNED, BUT THAT THE WORD "TYPE" PRESENTED GREAT DIFFICULTIES TO THEM BECAUSE OF ITS USE IN CONNECTION WITH HEAVY BOMBERS.

B. DEFINITION HEAVY BOMBERS

SCHUKIN SAID THAT DISCUSSION OF HEAVY BOMBER WOULD NOT HELP IN MOVING FORWARD ON THE DEFINITION OF A HEAVY BOMBER SINCE THE REAL ISSUE WAS WHETHER OR NOT BACKFIRE WOULD BE INCLUDED. ROWNY SAID THAT HE AGREED, AND THAT WE WERE FIRM IN OUR POSITION THAT THE BACKFIRE, BECAUSE OF ITS CAPABILITIES, WAS A HEAVY BOMBER. SCHUKIN SAID THAT A HIGH-LEVEL POLICY DECISION HAD BEEN MADE THAT UNLESS A BOMBER HAD A TWO-WAY CAPABILITY IT WOULD NOT BE COUNTED AS AN INTERCONTINENTAL BOMBER.

C. DATA BASE

ROWNY TOLD SCHUKIN THAT OUR DIFFICULTIES CONCERNING LAUNCHERS FOR ICBMS AND SLBMS AND CONCERNING HEAVY BOMBERS POINTED UP THE IMPORTANCE THE US ATTACHES TO THE DATA BASE CONCEPT. HE ADDED THAT AGREEMENT ON NUMBERS WOULD FACILITATE RESOLVING A MYRIAD OF PROBLEMS WHICH COULD NOT BE PUT INTO WORDS. SCHUKIN REPLIED THAT HE APPRECIATED THE IMPORTANCE THE US ATTACHES TO THE DATA BASE CONCEPT BUT THAT HE WOULD PREFER NOT TO DISCUSS IT FURTHER AT THIS TIME.

2. (STOERTZ-STOUT-SCHNEITER/TRUSOV-BELETISKY A-1281)

A. ICBM LAUNCHER DEFINITION

STOERTZ ASKED TRUSOV IF HE COULD EXPLAIN WHAT THE SOVIETS MEANT BY THE WORD "SPECIALLY" IN THE TERM "SPECIALLY DEVELOED AND DEPLOYED". TRUSOV INDICATED THAT THE MEANING WAS CLEAR IN THE THREE PLENARY STATEMENTS THAT THEY MADE ON THIS SUBJECT. IN PURSUING THE ISSUE FURTHER, TRUSOV SAID THAT AN ICBM LAUNCHER IS A "UNIQUE" LAUNCHER, SINCE AN ICBM CANNOT BE LAUNCHED FROM ANY LAUNCHERS BUT ONLY FROM "SPECIALLY DEVELOPED" LAUNCHERS.

B. THROW-WEIGHT DEFINITION

IN DISCUSSING THE THROW-WEIGHT DEFINITION, SCHNEITER INDICATED THERE APPEARED TO BE NO SUBSTANTIVE DISAGREEMENT ON THE TWO SIDES' FORMULATION OF THROW-WEIGHT DEFINITION, BUT FINDING THE PROPER LANGUAGE HAD PRESENTED A PROBLEM. IN THE DRAFTING WORKING GROUP THE SOVIET SIDE HAD STATED THAT "BUS" WAS AN INAPPROPRIATE TERM FOR TREATY LANGUAGE; THEREFORE THE US SIDE SUBSTITUTED THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00122 231758Z

TERM POST-BOOST VEHICLE (PBV) IN ITS PLACE. SCHNEITER WENT ON TO EXPLAIN THAT, SINCE THE NEW AGREEMENT WILL COVER A PERIOD UNTIL 1985, IT WAS IN OUR MUTUAL INTEREST TO HAVE THE AGREEMENT COVER THOSE CONFIGURATIONS WHICH MAY POSSIBLY BE DEVELOPED DURING THAT PERIOD. THUS, THE US SIDE SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED THE CASE OF A DEVICE WHICH WAS SIMILAR TO A BUS OR SELF-CONTAINED DISPENSING MECHANISM USED WITH MIRVS, BUT ONLY CARRIED A SINGLE RV. THE US WANTED TO MAKE CERTAIN THERE WAS MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING THAT

THE RV AND THE PBV, OR WHATEVER THAT DEVICE MAY BE CALLED, WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE THROW-WEIGHT.

TRUSOV SAID HE HAD REVIEWED THE VARIOUS PAPERS EXCHANGED AND CONVERSATIONS THAT HAD TAKEN PLACE, AND IT WAS CLEAR TO HIM THAT BOTH SIDES HAD AGREED ON USING THE TERM OF "SELF-CONTAINED DISPENSING MECHANISM" IN DESCRIBING A "BUS", BUT NOW THE TERM "POST-BOOST VEHICLE" HAS BROUGHT ON NEW UNCERTAINTIES TO ALL PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS. TRUSOV SAID THE NEW TERM WAS UNNECESSARY.

STORETZ ASKED TRUSOV WHAT THEY CALLED THE DEVICE WE REFER TO AS A PBV ON A SINGLE RV MISSILE? TRUSOV DID NOT ANSWER DIRECTLY OTHER THAN TO SAY HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND A CONFIGURATION WHICH HAS A SINGLE RV WITH A PBV.

TRUSOV EXPLAINED FURTHER THAT THE SELF-CONTAINED DISPENSING MECHANISM (US BUS OR SOVIET ABR) SERVES THE PURPOSE OF TARGETING AND DISPENSING MULTIPLE RVS AND WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE THROW-WEIGHT. ON THE OTHER HAND, TRUSOV SAID, A SINGLE RUV MISSILE COULD NOT HAVE SUCH A SELF-CONTAINED DISPENSING MECHANISM; AND ONLY THE RV, TOGETHER WITH WHATEVER WAS ATTACHED TO IT, SUCH AS A GUIDANCE PACKAGE, ROCKET ENGINES, AND AERODYNAMIC SURFACES, WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE THROW-WEIGHT FORMULATION. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MEETING REPORTS, NEGOTIATIONS, ICBM, MIRV
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 APR 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: saccheem
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT00122
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760154-1031
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760429/aaaaayaw.tel
Line Count: 135
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: saccheem
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 MAY 2004 by woolflhd>; APPROVED <22 SEP 2004 by saccheem>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-PLENARY DISCUSSIONS, APRIL 22, 1976 (SALT TWO - 988)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006